

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTERREMARKS/ARGUMENTS

JAN 23 2007

The above amendment and the following remarks accompany a Request for Continued Examination filed herewith and are in reply to the final Office Action of 10/23/2006. In light of this reply, reconsideration and further examination of this application are respectfully requested.

Eight claims (45 and 51–57) are pending in this application. In light of the following remarks, reconsideration of these claims is respectfully requested.

In section 1 of the final Office action, the Examiner stated that,

*"Newly submitted claims 53–57 are directed to **an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed** for the following reason(s) set in the requirement for restriction/election dated 06/17/2004. Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 53–57 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03."* (Emphasis added.)"

It is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider this holding, for the following reasons.

In the Election/Restriction requirement of 06/17/2004, the Applicant was required to elect between two purportedly distinct inventions: "I. Claims 45 and 51, drawn to a display device with a supporting [sic]," and II. "Claims 46–50, drawn to a display device with a lamp housing." Responsive thereto, on 11/12/2004, the Applicant elected claims 45 and 51, both directed to "a display device," of which claim 51 has been allowed.

As may be seen from a consideration of dependent claims 52–57, all are dependent, directly or indirectly, from claim 51, and are therefore necessarily directed to the same invention that was originally claimed in claim 51, namely, "a display device." Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has erred in holding claims 53–57 are directed to "an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed," and that these claims should therefore be considered and examined on the merits.

In section 3 of the Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 45 and 52 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto, US Patent No. 5,442,470, in view of Lee, US Patent No. 5,988,827, stating, in pertinent part,

"Hashimoto discloses a liquid crystal display (LCD) device (figure 2) having a mold frame (4), an LCD panel (1), a circuit board (3) fitting in a groove (4b) formed from lower surface of the frame (4), wherein the circuit board (3) was electrically coupled to the LCD panel (1) by a plurality of flexible printed circuits (FPC) (col. 4, ln. 43) and the FPC is bent in a U-shaped (fig.

3, col. 4, in. 62). *Hashimoto, however, does not explicitly disclose the circuit board having a driver integrated circuit (IC).* Lee does disclose a circuit board may include a plurality of ICs, which connected to the LCD (col. 2, in. 63)." (Emphasis added.)

Independent claim 45 of the present invention includes the following limitation:

"a groove formed on the lower surface of the mold frame, the groove receiving the driver IC when the FPC is bent toward the lower surface of the mold frame."

By contrast, Hashimoto ('470) teaches a plurality of U-shaped "frame members 8" that attach to selected side edges of the display panel 1 ('470, Figs. 1-4; col. 5, line 4, *et seq.*). The "mold frame (4)" referred to by the Examiner above are, in fact, a plurality of optional, clip-like "holder members 4" that are used to attach the PCB 3 to the liquid crystal panel 1 in a "dove-tail" manner ('470, col. 4, line 24, *et seq.*) Moreover, an "integrated circuit 7" for driving the liquid crystal panel is mounted on the "flexible printed circuit 6" (*Id.*, col. 6, line 67), and "the [folded over] flexible printed circuit 6 [along with the PCB 3, the IC 7 and the holder member 4] [are] completely received in the space inside the frame member 8 so that [they are] hidden from view and cannot be touched from the outside" (*Id.*, Figs. 2-4; col. 5, lines 7-11, emphasis added.)

Thus, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, the '470 lacks any "grooves" formed on the lower surface of the "frame member 8" to receive the ICs 7, and because the folded over FPC is contained entirely within the U-shaped channel of the frame member 8, the FPC cannot be "bent toward the lower surface of the mold frame," because that surface is located outside of the frame member 8, not inside it.

This arrangement should be compared with the configuration illustrated in, e.g., Figs. 4B, 6, 7 and 14 of the instant invention, wherein the FCPs 342 (see Fig. 7) fold over the outside edge of the mold frame 200, such that the driver ICs 344 (Figs. 7 and 14) are received in respective ones of the IC receiving grooves 222 (Fig. 4B) formed on the lower surface of the mold frame. (Fig. 14; pars. [0081], [0118].)

In view of the above substantial structural differences between the arrangement of Hashimoto and claim 45 of the present invention, the Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections of claims 45 and 52 in view Hashimoto and Lee.

App. Ser. No. 10/608,008

Docket No. AB-1581-1C US

Amendment dated January 23, 2007

(Ref. No. LW5007US (CPA)(CA))

Reply to final Office action of Oct. 23, 2006

In sections 4 and 5 of the Office action, the Examiner stated, "The terminal disclaimer filed on 08/01/2006 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of the US Patent 6,862,053 has been reviewed and is NOT accepted," because, "An attorney or agent, not of record, is not authorized to sign a terminal disclaimer in the capacity as an attorney or agent acting in a representative capacity as provided by 37 CFR 1.34 (a). See 37 CFR 1.321(b) and/or (c)." (Emphasis added.)

Responsively, on 11/10/2006, the Applicant filed the attached power of attorney in this Application, and a new terminal disclaimer, executed by one of the attorneys now of record in this Application by virtue of said power, is filed herewith. The Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection of claim 45 as being unpatentable over claim 8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,862,053 be withdrawn.

In section 6 of the final Office action, the Examiner allowed independent claim 51. However, in light of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that claims 45 and 51 – 57 are all allowable over the art of record. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

If there are any questions regarding this Reply, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number indicated below.

Certification of Facsimile Transmission

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

Saundra L. Carr
Saundra L. Carr

January 23, 2007
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,

Don C. Lawrence

Don C. Lawrence
Reg. No. 31,975
Applicant's attorney
Tel.: (949) 752-7040

Encl.: Power of Attorney, as stated above.
Terminal Disclaimer, as stated above.